DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 507 HE 008 106

TITLE	Proceedings of the Workshop on Instructional Development Held at Wilfrid Laurier University, March 1976.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development, Toronto.
PUB DATE	23 Mar 76
NOTE	60p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; College Cooperation; Conference Reports; Educational Objectives; *Higher Education; *Instructional Design; *Instructional Improvement; *Intercollegiate Programs; Learning Motivation; Teaching Methods; *Teaching Techniques; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Instructional Development; *Ontario

ABSTRACT

The Workshop on Instructional Development was one of a number of workshops organized on various issues concerning teaching and learning in the Ontario universities. It was held in an attempt to provide some exchange of information among the Ontario universities on the organized activities initiated on their campuses concerned with improving teaching and learning. The various universities are at varying stages of development in these activities, partly due to financial constraints. Presentations were made by five universities: Carleton, Guelph, McMaster, York, and Windsor. The workshop was attended by many of the vice-presidents (academic) of the Ontario universities or those of similar office together with the liaison officers who maintain contact with the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development. Edited transcripts of group discussions among these representatives are included in this report. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125507

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

WORKSHOP ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

HELD AT

WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY MARCH 1976

HE008106

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SPONSORED BY THE ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES PROGRAM FOR INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

WORKSHOP ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Wilfrid Laurier University

March 23, 1976

* * * * * *

Organized by:

Arthur Knowles - Director of Continuing Education,
Wilfrid Laurier University

Fred Parrett - Director, Ontario Universities Program
for Instructional Development

PROCEEDINGS OF THE

WORKSHOP ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

I N D E X

	Page
Timetable	1
Introduction by F.W. Parrett	2
Participants (advance registrations only)	3
Summaries of University Presentations	
(a) Carleton University	4
(b) McMaster University	9
(c) University of Guelph	20
(d) York University	27
(e) University of Windsor	41
Summaries of Group Discussions	
(a) Group A - reported by P.P.M. Meincke	45
(b) Group B - reported by G. Harrower	47
(c) Group C - reported by H. Murray	52
(d) Group D - reported by F. Turner	54
(e) Group E - reported by M.K. Lane	56

SCHEDULE - WORKSHOP ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

March 23, 1976 - Wilfrid Laurier University

* * * * * * * * *

Meeting will commence in the Mezzanine of the Arts Building

9:00 - 9:15 a.m.	- Introduction: Professor F. Turner F.W. Parrett
9:15 - 10:15 a.m.	- Carleton University
10:15 - 11:00 a.m.	- McMaster University
11:00 - 11:15 a.m.	- Coffee
11:15 - 12:00 noon	- University of Guelph
12:00 - 12:30 p.m.	- York University
12:30 - 1:00 p.m.	- University of Windsor
1:00 - 2:00 p.m.	- Lunch (*Mezzanine*)
2:00 - 3:30 p.m.	- Group Discussion (*Rooms to be announced*)
3:30 - 4:00 p.m.	- Reports from Groups, Final Discussion, Conclusion (*Mezzanine*)

INTRODUCTION BY F.W. PARRETT

Director, Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development

This booklet contains the invited papers at a Workshop on Instructional Development held at Wilfrid Laurier University on March 23, 1976. It is one of a number of workshops organized by the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development on various issues concerning teaching and learning in the Ontario universities.

There has been increasing concern in all universities in many parts of the world with a close examination of the ways in which we teach and the problems and approaches to learning. Certainly, the faculty in the Ontario universities have been part of this international development, and yet the lines of communication, although well established in discipline-centred research activities, have not yet developed to any sophisticated degree in the area of "Instructional Development". This workshop was held in an attempt to provide some exchange of information among the Ontario universities on the organized activities concerned with improving teaching and learning that had been initiated on their campuses. Clearly, the various Ontario universities are at varying stages of development in these activities, and this reflects the ways in which they have seen their needs in this direction being fulfilled, especially in the current climate of financial constraint.

The morning session of this workshop consisted of presentations by five universities: Carleton, Guelph, McMaster, York and Windsor. It should not be inferred that the other universities are not concerned with the importance of teaching and learning. In a one-day session it was impossible to accommodate reports from all those who could have given them. Indeed, in some universities the relevant activities are so varied tha it would have been difficult to schedule presentations from them in the available time.

The workshop was attended by many of the vice-presidents (academic) of the Ontario universities or those of similar office together with the liaison officers appointed by the universities to maintain contact with the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development.

In the afternoon session, these delegates formed five groups to discuss the models of instructional development activities that had been presented and the value of these activities in their own universities. The reports of the five group leaders following these discussions were taped, and edited transcripts of these reports are included in the final section of this booklet.

WORKSHOP ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Wilfrid Laurier University - March 23, 1976

* * * * * * * *

List of Participants

Note: L.O. = OUPID Liaison Officer, * = Group Leader,
I.C. = former Interim Committee on Instructional Development,
C.C. = C.O.U. Committee on Teaching & Learning

Group A

*Peter Meincke
Toronto (L.O.)

Igor Kusyszyn
York

Dave Pearson,
Laurentian (C.C.)

Leon Regan
York (C.C.)

Terrence Sculley
Wilfrid Laurier

Pat Speight
O.C.U.F.A.

Neale Tayler
Wilfrid Laurier (L.O.)

J.L. Wolfson
Carleton

Don Woods
McMaster (L.O.)

Group B

*George Harrower
Queen's

Arthur Knowles
Wilfrid Laurier

Kathryn Koenig
York

Don George
Carleton (C.C.)

T. Guinsburg
Western

Alvin Lee
McMaster

Don MacRae
Brock

Jessie MacFarlane
Western (C.C.)

Russell Muncaster
Wilfrid Laurier

Group C

*Harry Murray
Western

D. Cameron
Trent

Mike Chorney
R.M.C. (L.O.)

Ron Keast
O.E.C.A. (I.C.)

Basil Healey
Wilfrid Laurier

Dave Humphreys
McMaster (C.C.)

June Landsburg
Carleton

Donovan Thomas
Windsor

Ed Ware
Waterloo (L.O.)

Group D

*F. Turner
Wilfrid Laurier

Chris Furedy
York

Paul Gardner
M.C.U. (I.C.)

John Kirkness
Toronto (C.C.)

E.B. MacNaughton
Guelph

J. Mothersill
Lakehead

Geoff Norman
McMaster

Doug Rogers
R.M.C.

Group F

*Mary Lane
Wilfrid Laurier

T. Brzustowski
Waterloo

Alan Gold
Windsor

J. Green
York

Norma Grindal
(I.C.)

John Neill
Guelph (L.O.)(C.C.)

Fred Parrett
O.U.P.I.D. (C.C.)

R. Swirsky
Ryerson

CARLETON UNIVERSITY

Donald George - June Landsburg

CARLETON UNIVERSITY

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In the spring of 1973 a proposal was presented to the various academic bodies of the University for the creation of an Instructional Development Committee. Subsequent to the discussion generated by the proposal, the Senate Executive Committee, in June 1973 decided that a committee to deal with questions such as course and teacher evaluation, improving teacher effectiveness and new techniques appropriate for university-level instruction should be set up under the Vice-President (Academic).

The Senate Committee on Instructional Development was created by Senate on March 14, 1974, as the successor to the above-mentioned Vice-Presidential committee which had operated during the 1973-74 academic year. The Terms of Reference established by Senate are:

1. To analyse and develop techniques for general course evaluation and develop methods by which instructors may receive advice, guidance and training relating to instructional techniques.

2. To encourage, support and assist with the exploration, development, and evaluation of teaching/learning methods using contemporary techniques in course design and presentation and to disseminate information on new developments in the teaching/learning process.

3. To facilitate communication between, and establish workshops and forums for members of the University and other individuals or groups interested in the application of new educational techniques and educational technology.

4. To develop and maintain liaison with the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development and any other similar bodies.

5. To co-ordinate policy with regard to purchase, installation, maintenance, use, distribution and availability of instructional aids on campus in an attempt to minimize duplication and overlap and maximize choice of services.

6. To report to Senate.

An inventory of existing endeavours in Instructional Development was prepared and is updated on a continuing basis. The Committee decided its work could be most effectively organized by creating task forces and sub committees to address themselves to particular areas of Instructional Development. These include:

Task Force on Computer-Assisted Learning - this group holds a series of informal seminars bringing together individuals who have a common interest in using Computer-Assisted Learning.

Task Force on Introduction to Computer Programming - a wide variety of computer programming courses are offered throughout the University. This Task Force is looking at incorporating these programs and providing one introductory course on Fortran which can be used by all disciplines and which, with modifications, can be offered as a compulsory, optional or self-instructional program for general interest.

Task Force on the Provision and Maintenance of Adequate Teaching Facilities - this group is at present conducting an inventory of teaching facilities in classrooms and seminar rooms and making recommendations on the installation of adequate teaching/learning aids. These include: wall-hung projection screens, map rails, lecterns, electrical outlets, permanently-installed film/slide projectors.

Task Force on the Use of Computers in Student Evaluation - the entire question of the use of computers in randomized testing, student grading, performance, evaluation, etc. will be studied.

Task Force on Basic Learning Skills - there is a general recognition that many university students suffer serious impediments to their capability to learn. Two basic problems exist: one is that often basic skills are so poorly developed that new material and concepts cannot be assimilated; the other is the lack of any clear idea of how to study and learn. Various efforts are being made on campus to provide assistance to students with one or both of these problems. At the moment while there is communication and cooperation between the several ventures this is fairly casual and it is felt some structure is needed. The Task Force will consider a plan for the organization, location, finance and advertising of a Study Skills Centre.

Users' Group on Resource Centres - Scattered throughout the campus were countless resource centres operating in complete isolation. It was the task of this Users' Group to bring these areas together for exchange of information and facilities, and to also make their services known to students faculty and staff. Initially 30 centres were located and a booklet was printed entitled "Resources For Courses - A Selective Guide to Resource Centres at Carleton University", and made available to everyone. A detailed description of these centres was made available to all Resource Centres' staff. This group is now looking into preventing further duplication of services, itemizing and cataloguing all hardware and software on campus, investigating ways and means in which these resource centres may be used by the outside community and establishing the criteria for determining the operational effectiveness of resource centres.

Working Group on the Role of Examinations and Tests as Learning Devices - at a superficial glance it was noted that departments and schools at Carleton use different methods to measure student performance, at the undergraduate and graduate level. Some disciplines conduct regular tests, take-home examinations, and mid and end-of-term examinations on a formal basis, while others do not. All areas are being surveyed on the ways in which student performance is measured and this data will be printed and made available for general information.

Continuing Activities

A major responsibility of the Office of Instructional Development is liaison with other groups and organizations interested in the areas of instructional development and educational technology. These include the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development, the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the NRC Associate Committee on Instructional Development, the Division of Radio and Electrical Engineering of the National Research Council, other Universities and Colleges, the Ottawa Education Liaison Council, the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, the Federal Department of Communications, Eastern Ontario Science Centre and Project Cartier - Cooperation for Education and Training (coordinated by the Canadian Teachers' Federation).

An information resource centre consisting of a collection of materials on instructional development is maintained. A catalogue has been distributed to faculty, students and staff and materials may be taken out on loan.

An Instructional Development newsletter is published monthly and distributed to faculty, students and staff on campus and individuals in other educational institutions, businesses and government agencies in North America and in other parts of the world. The newsletter contains articles on activities at Carleton in the areas of instructional and educational research and innovation, similar activities at other institutions and has a "coming events" column listing seminars, workshops, conferences, etc. being held in Canada, the United States and Europe.

The secretariat provides general administrative support for the various subcommittees of the Senate Committee on Instructional Development, and also maintains liaison with the Instructional Aids Department and other groups in order to co-ordinate policy with regard to purchase, installation, maintenance, use, distribution and availability of instructional aids on campus. Cooperative ventures are also a feature of this liaison.

To facilitate communication between individuals and groups interested in the application of new techniques and educational technology, the Committee sponsors lectures, seminars, workshops and other similar activities, both formal and informal. With the assistance of a grant from the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development, a Summer Institute will again be held during June 1976. The program will consist of a series of workshops on various aspects of instructional development. Participants will be welcomed from any Ontario university and a registration fee of $50. will be charged.

Grants-in-aid of innovation in teaching and learning, and other activities relating to instructional development are an important aspect of our mandate and during 1974-75 $36,515. was awarded to Carleton faculty and staff. The Committee has also made five graduate teaching assistantships available through the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research. The students involved work on specific assignments relating to instructional development.

Work continues on a project aimed at field testing an instructional program aimed at the development of the teaching skills of graduate students and new university teachers. These materials were originated by the McGill University Centre for Learning and Development.

The Committee is considering ways of encouraging and rewarding excellence in teaching and in the development of learning innovations at Carleton through a proposed program of Instructional Development Fellowships.

Activities planned in the area of course evaluation (as suggested by Senate) is no longer financially possible, due to financial stringency. However, efforts to assist people in the improvement of courses will continue, supported by the Instructional Development resource centre, workshops and the Instructional Aids Department.

A further activity at Carleton aimed at improving the processes of teaching and learning is the Educational Communications Project which has received some support through the Committee but which obtains its primary financing from external sponsors. This work includes the offering of courses jointly by Carleton University and Stanford University in California through the medium of the CTS Communications Satellite, and the offering of Carleton courses through local radio and television.

The Office is co-operating with a study on the desirability for an increased emphasis on continuing and non-traditional studies at Carleton University. Such activities have been a tradition at this institution, but have not, during the past decade or more, received the same attention as have full time studies.

Marshall McLuhan once said that "a child goes to school to interrupt his education". Hopefully through our Senate Committee on Instructional Development the situation will be alleviated. Education is a continuous and ongoing event in our lives, and it is the mandate of this Committee to see that the advances in educational techniques keep pace with man's advances in knowledge.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

Dave Humphreys - Geoff Norman - Don Woods

REPORT TO WORKSHOP ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

WILFRED LAURIER UNIVERSITY

March 23, 1976,

from McMaster University.

Four major activities to improve teaching and learning are activities:

1. to encourage,
2. to provide direct resources,
3. to provide indirect resources, and
4. that focus on learning.

1. Activities to Encourage Good Teaching.

The President's Committee for Instructional Development, that reports directly to the President, undertakes any activity that will improve the atmosphere to encourage and promote good teaching. This committee is mainly an idea committee. The five members are representative of the different parts of the campus, including the student sector. The chairman of this committee is also the Liaison Officer whose role is to liaise with the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development (OUPID) and with other liaison officers on the different campuses in the province.

Past achievements include the introduction of internal Faculty grants for Part-time Release for Instructional Development and Academic Advisory Council operating Grants for Instructional Development. At present the Committee is identifying and publicizing examples of innovative teaching, co-sponsoring teaching-learning seminars, listening to students' comments on teaching and learning and interacting with the two centres that assist faculty members improve teaching and learning: the Program for Educational Development in Health Sciences, PED, and the Instructional Development Centre, IDC.

What funds we need are obtained directly from the President.

2. Activities to Provide Direct Resources to Assist Faculty Members.

There are four main resources: the two groups or centres to assist faculty members to improve (mentioned above) and the internal and external grants.

a "The Program for Educational Development in the Health Sciences", co-ordinated by Dr. V.R. Neufeld, provides faculty members with consultative and research services. For example, advice is given to departments on

admissions selection, development of new evaluation methods, development of evaluation of new learning resources, and faculty member development. An example of research is to determine the clinical problem-solving processes of practising physicians and medical students. The Program is funded partly by internal funds and partly by research grants, including grants from the Province of Ontario. The Coordinator, Dr. Neufeld, is responsible for budget, activities, personnel, and reports to the Associate Dean (Education) for development activities, and to the chairman of the committee on scientific development for research activities. The Program has 21 faculty members who are involved part-time in educational research and development, and 8 research associates and assistants.

b The Instructional Development Centre (Director, Dr. D.A. Humphreys) provides a consultative service. The Centre is funded from University funds although part of the activities of the members includes direct participation in research funded from outside agencies. The Director is responsible to and reports to the Vice-President (Academic). The program has 1.1/2 full-time educational professionals.

The services offered by the Centre include:

a. A consultation service for faculty members who may wish to discuss any aspect of their courses.

b. Seminars on topics related to teaching and learning.

c. Workshops on topics requested by faculty members.

d. A library of books and other resources on instructional development.

e. News about teaching and learning from McMaster and from other universities.

c The internal grants are administered by the Academic Advisory Council with the selection procedure carried out by the President's Committee for Instructional Development. The criteria for a grant are the same as those used by OUPID; each application is reviewed by external reviewers for financial and educational feasibility. In 1975-76, three release grants and four operating grants were awarded for use in 1976-77.

d The PED and ICD, the Liaison Officer, and the Office of Research Services are available to assist individuals in finding financial support for their projects from outside the University.

3. Activities that Provide Indirect Resources to Faculty Members.

The printing department, audio visual department, and the bookstore offer

services to help professors write and publish their own set of lecture notes, write a TV script, or prepare a slide-tape show.

4. Activities that Focus on Learning.

Some special activities are the Student Counselling Service and the Resource Centre.

The Student Counselling Service provides personalized assistance in note-taking, improving reading, essay writing, and learning how to write exams. These services are part of the overall counselling services under the Director, Mr. R. Heinzl. He reports to the Dean of Students. There is one professional assigned to the study skills program.

The Resource Centre caters to the first courses and some self-paced courses. It has enrichment material to complement classroom instruction. This one large room is equipped with TV and slide-tape playback units, and take-home programs. This is complemented by separate rooms as drop-in centres with tutorial assistance in Mathematics, Applied Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry and Biology.

The staff of the Resource Centre report to the Science Librarian.

March 10th 1976

D. R. WOODS
Liaison Officer.

INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTRE / McMASTER UNIVERSITY
HAMILTON, ONTARIO, L8S 4M1
525-9140 Ext. 4408, 4540

A TEACHING IMPROVEMENT PROCESS

One of the services which the Instructional Development Centre will be evaluating this year is the Teaching Improvement Process developed at the University of Massachussets. This process is now in use at several universities in the U.S.A. and at McGill University in Montreal. The following description of the Process was prepared by the staff of McGill's Instructional Development Service Project. It provides a fairly detailed description of how the Process is being used in a Canadian university. One of the aims of our Centre is to assess the usefulness of this approach at McMaster and to determine any necessary modifications for its use here.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

Before describing each aspect of the programme, several assumptions of the Instructional Development Service Project should be emphasized briefly. First, we believe that universities should allow instructors the opportunity to take a critical look at their instruction with no fear of the results being used for personnel decisions. Thus, we have designed the Project to be used on a voluntary and strictly confidential basis. All data collected and analyses made are seen only by the instructor and the staff of the Project. Any other use of the data is controlled solely by the instructor.

The second assumption is that there is no one best way to teach. There are advantages to the lecture method, the discussion session, simulations, tutorials or whatever other method may be

used. In keeping with this philosophy, teaching improvement specialists work with an instructor to identify that teaching style which is most appropriate for him or her and which is most appropriate for the given situation. The Project does not try to influence instructors to move toward one particular teaching style.

The third assumption is that the use of this improvement process and the teaching skills and behaviors by which we analyse teaching, are applicable across disciplines, class sizes, and styles of teaching, as well as at the undergraduate and graduate levels. This is not to say that the process or the skills and behaviors always will be used in the same fashion, but merely that they can be applied to many different situations. Accordingly, the improvement process has been tested in hospital ward rounds, laboratory classes, small groups, and large classes of up to 500 students. Additionally, it has been tested in such varied disciplines as Law, Medicine, Engineering, English, Computer Science, History, Business, Anthropology, Biology, Chemistry and Psychology. Finally, the process has been used at the elementary and secondary level as well as at universities.

The fourth assumption is that instructors do not have to have teaching problems in order to make use of this process. It is entirely possible that an instructor can enter the process with the knowledge that his or her teaching is adequate in the eyes of students and himself or herself. In this sense, the process can be used solely to continue to develop one's teaching ability.

The fifth assumption is that critically examining learning skills is equally as important as critically examining teaching skills. Occasionally, problems in a classroom may relate more to learning difficulties of students than to teaching difficulties of instructors. If, after examining all of the data, the teaching improvement specialist and the instructor agree that this is the case, then appropriate intervention strategies may be designed to deal with the problem.

The final assumption, and perhaps the most important one, is that the teaching improvement process is flexible. While we strongly encourage instructors to go through the entire process, there are a variety of ways in which this can be accomplished, for the process can be used to take a critical look at one's teaching, to test specific ways to improve that teaching, or to design and to test vastly different teaching styles. By dealing with individual instructors from the basis of their present teaching styles, the Instructional Development Service Project hopes to continue this procedural flexibility in order to create for instructors a forum in which changes can take place that are beneficial both to themselves and to students.

THE TEACHING IMPROVEMENT PROCESS

The teaching improvement process is a program designed to assist instructors in taking a critical look at their classroom teaching. Specifically, it involves the identification and improvement of instructional strengths and weaknesses, through the collection, analysis and interpretation of data from a variety of sources. The entire process is undertaken by faculty members for a full term, with the ongoing assistance and support of trained teaching improvement specialists.

The first step of the process (see TABLE ONE for an outline of the entire process) is a personal interview between the teaching improvement specialist and the faculty member. The interview affords the teaching improvement specialist the opportunity to establish a working relationship with the professor and to gather some preliminary information about the course and the class. This information includes a course description, syllabus, reading list, objectives, assignments, and examinations. In addition, the initial interview is used to schedule the various steps of the process and to answer any questions which the faculty member may have. Typically, the interview requires 45-90 minutes of the faculty member's time.

TABLE ONE

Teaching Improvement Process

1. Initial interview between teaching improvement specialist and faculty member to establish working procedure, to gather preliminary information and to answer questions about the process.
2. Data gathering through the use of classroom observation, questionnaire, and videotape.
3. Data processing, synthesizing and presentation of results to the faculty member for independent review.
4. Conference between teaching improvement specialist and faculty member for review and discussion of data and videotape excerpts. Development of improvement strategies.
5. Implementation of improvement strategies by the faculty member.
6. Evaluation of the effect of improvement strategies, through the re-use of the data-gathering devices.
7. Final review of data and evaluation of the teaching improvement process.

Following the initial interview, data about the class is collected by several means. First, a class session is observed by the teaching improvement specialist. Then, in a subsequent class, a questionnaire is administered to the students and to the faculty member. To complete this data collection stage, a segment of the class period is videotaped. The questionnaire requires approximately 15-20 minutes of class time and the videotape generally is made during the remainder of the class period.

Although adaptations are sometimes made, the questionnaire presently used by the Project is the Teaching Analysis by Students (TABS), designed at the Clinic to Improve University Teaching. The TABS instrument includes statements describing a variety of teaching behaviors considered important across disciplines and instructional modes. These items were derived from the descriptions of teaching skills and behaviors extracted from the work of Hildebrand, Wilson and Dienst (1971), the Stanford microteaching literature and the teaching experience of the Clinic staff. For each item, students are asked to decide whether they think the instructor's performance is satisfactory or in need of improvement. Questionnaire results, in conjunction with the faculty member's self-assessment and predictions of student responses on the questionnaire, often cue the teaching improvement specialist and the instructor to appropriate areas upon which to focus during the next stage of the instructional improvement process.

After the results of the student questionnaire, the faculty self-assessment, and predictions of students' responses are processed by computer, the teaching improvement specialist summarizes and synthesizes all data for an independent review by the instructor. Next, the instructor and the teaching improvement specialist together evaluate the data and attempt to identify the instructor's specific strengths and weaknesses. They then decide which of these the instructor will work toward improving. This data review, analysis and negotiation process will usually involve 60-90 minutes of the instructor's time.

The consultation session often leads to dramatic changes in teaching behavior, with little or no further help from the teaching improvement specialist. However, there is available an assortment of teaching improvement strategies which the teaching improvement specialist and the instructor may agree to work together to implement. Many of these strategies have been developed and tested at the Project, at the Clinic, and at McGill's Centre For Learning and Development. The Project's staff continues to work toward creating and testing additional ones.

Teaching improvement strategies are procedures for providing instructors with the expertise needed to change their teaching behavior. These range from simply asking an instructor to try out some easily undertaken teaching techniques which other teachers have found useful, to giving an instructor appropriate reading materials on the skill or behavior, to training through microteaching, to the repeated use of practice-observation-critique cycles within the classroom. Such training strategies are usually undertaken with the assistance of the teaching improvement specialist. The strategies may focus directly on teaching skills or behaviors which have been identified as problems, or on the development of compensatory skills.

Improvement strategies are nearly always used in conjunction with monitoring techniques--ways of collecting information from a number of sources about the effects of improvement efforts in the classroom. Examples include various types of student questionnaires and tests of learning, collecting and reviewing classroom video or audio tapes, and classroom observation and feedback by a teaching improvement specialist. Improvement strategies vary substantially in the amounts of time which they demand of faculty members. The time spent is always negotiated, but usually will range from three to ten hours over a period of several weeks.

The implementation of teaching improvement strategies is followed by an evaluation of the efforts of the instructor and the teaching improvement specialist. This process involves a final videotaping of a classroom segment and the administration of a shortened version of the questionnaire. The questions used will depend on which skills and behaviors were isolated for improvement purposes. Then, during a final session between the teaching improvement specialist and the faculty member, the data collected is examined for evidence of improvement. At the close of this session, the instructor is asked to complete a questionnaire assessing the teaching improvement process, the improvement strategies, and the teaching improvement specialist. Arrangements may also be made then for further work on the instructor's teaching. This final data collection and analysis will ordinarily take up another 20 minutes of class time and 60-75 minutes of instructor time.

For further information please contact Alan Blizzard, extension 4540.

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH

John Neill

THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH SENATE COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

J. A. Neill
University of Guelph

The Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning, known originally as the Committee on Methods of Instruction came into being almost 10 years ago. Its general objective was "to help faculty to increase their understanding of the processes of learning and teaching so that the teachers may act more effectively in helping students to learn." Five years ago, the committee began publication of Teaching Forum. Five years ago the committee appointed its first part-time coordinator, four years ago its second and almost two years ago, its third, Dr. J. A. Neill from the Department of Psychology.

In 1973 the Committee on Teaching and Learning became a standing committee of Senate. It now has the following duties:

> The Committee on Teaching and Learning shall
>
> (a) when directed by Senate or on its own initiative, study and make recommendations to Senate on matters which affect teaching and learning in the University;
>
> (b) inform faculty, through lectures, workshops, and publications, on developments in teaching and learning and help put into practice those developments which would enhance teaching and learning processes;
>
> (c) encourage and facilitate, through student evaluations and other appropriate means, the maximum exchange of views between teachers and students; and
>
> (d) foster the integration of the resources of the university in pursuit of its educational objectives (Senate Bylaws).

The article by J. C. M. Shute and D. C. Tulloch, "Improving University Teaching", was written about two years ago and provides an overview of the emergence of the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning on the Guelph campus. Below are listed several major areas of current activity sponsored by the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning.

Publications

We continue to publish Teaching Forum and distribute it to all faculty and graduate students at the University of Guelph. The two most recent issues are attached.

So that the University Library may purchase books in the area of improvement of teaching and learning we were given a library allocation of $400. Finally, the bookstore is cooperative in stocking books the committee requests.

Teaching and Course Evaluation

We continue to distribute to those who request it the Course Evaluation Form described by Shute and Tulloch. In addition to the questionnaire, we provide through the coordinator's office routine scoring of optical mark answer cards, regardless of what course evaluation questionnaire the instructor used. The results go solely to the instructor.

The major new thrust in the area of evaluation of teaching is the more direct help to individual faculty members, departments and college committees in developing their own course evaluation instruments. The work on developing an item bank has been assisted by a small grant from OUPID. More details may be found in the articles in Teaching Forum.

Living-Learning Centres

The Senate Committee has general responsibility for the establishment of and policies for living-learning centres on campus. A living-learning centre is a residence unit which is given over to a specific interest group for the purpose of supplementing classroom education with other forms of educational experience in an informal living environment. Such a centre integrates residential life with the intellectual concerns of the university. At present there are three such living-learning centres: International House, French House, and Arts House. In January, 1976, Senate approved the establishment of a fourth living-learning centre, Spanish House.

Workshops

The Committee has been able to send its coordinator and others to attend a few instructional development workshops. One result has been that we have been able to offer a teaching skills workshop at the University of Guelph. It was well accepted and we expect to run further workshops.

Grants

The University of Guelph Senate allocated $2000 to the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning for distribution as small instructional development grants to faculty who wish to develop new teaching materials. We awarded six grants this academic year.

Other

The Office of Continuing Education offered a course entitled "New Ways to Help People Learn". The Senate Committee on Teaching and

Learning provided a partial tuition rebate for 20 faculty members who attended the course.

Additional funds for special purposes have been forthcoming from the office of the Vice-President (Academic); for example, Guelph faculty members who are attending the May "Workshop for University Teachers" (OUPID) will have their registration fees subsidized.

Budget

The Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning has a budget which pays 50% of the coordinator's salary as well as about $8000 for part-time help, travel, computing, entertainment, and general operating expenses. The $8000 is exclusive of the $2000 for instructional development grants and the $400 library allocation.

It is appropriate to end this brief report by quoting Shute and Tulloch of two years ago. They cited as one of the reasons for the program's acceptance at the University of Guelph as "Top-level support by the University's President, Vice-President Academic and other senior administration." The top-level support continues to exist and continues to be crucial.

IMPROVING UNIVERSITY TEACHING[1]

J.C.M. Shute and D.C. Tulloch
University of Guelph

With perverse pride, the universities of the world have tolerated vague, ineffective and, all too commonly, downright bad teaching. The reasons for this seem connected to an elitist concept of the university as a repository of the intellectual heritage of the world, with only a secondary concern for the function of teaching. "The academic Achilles' Heel is a low level of teaching performance which the institutions have not seriously tried to improve" (Whitfield & Brammer, 1972). In essence, the problem of teaching at a university is that the reward structure penalizes good teaching in favour of research and publications (or frequently publication without research), for good teaching takes time and faculty members allocate time in the most rewarding manner. One reason for this state of affairs is simply the difficulty of assessing and rewarding good teaching compared to the relative ease of establishing a publications record that ensures both vertical and geographical mobility.

During the last decade, however, two trends have emerged which may alter this picture. The first of these is the rise of the student. Nearly all universities in the past decade have been made aware of the student as learner and person. The student of the seventies, although not preoccupied with the often open revolt of the sixties, is likely to be less tolerant of sloppy and arrogant teaching and treatment than the student of the fifties. The second, is, of course, the need for funding. With formula financing becoming the rule in more jurisdictions, there is a pressing need to attract good students. One of the ways to attract these is by stimulating and interesting teaching that rewards the student with learning. In the longer term, of course, one of the ultimate tests of a university's success is the number of children and grandchildren of alumni who are enrolled and the contributions that are made to the alumni or alma mater fund. Several Canadian universities, in the words of E.F. Sheffield "have institutional programs for the improvement of teaching, and many others have, or have had recently, committees looking into the possibilities" (Sheffield, 1973). The University of Guelph is one he does not cite but which has been working at improving teaching and learning. The University of Guelph grew from three small agriculturally-based colleges with a heavy research emphasis to a multi-faculty university of over eight thousand students in less than a decade. With this growth there naturally was some concern over the quality of teaching. In 1969 the Senate established a standing Committee on Teaching and Learning with the objective of improving the quality of teaching and learning on the campus. The Department of Extension Education on campus played a central role in the work of the Committee as both of the faculty members who have served as co-ordinators of this committee, on a half-time basis, came from this department.

Basically the activites undertaken have been:

(a) Conducting a course evaluation program using a simple but progressively modified questionnaire format with a 5-point scale response.

---

[1]Unpublished report, 1974.

This form is used by faculty members in each of the three academic semesters each year. About 13,000 forms per semester are requested by faculty.

(b) Holding courses, workshops and seminars on teaching techniques led either by guests or faculty members on campus.

(c) a training program for graduate teaching assistants.

(d) Exhibiting and explaining hardware and software in conjunction with suppliers and the university's audio-visual department.

(e) Consultation with faculty members on either an individual basis or by department.

It is reasonably safe to say that the program at the University of Guelph has gained acceptance by members of faculty. Why? The reasons are complex and intertwined, but a good deal of this success appears to stem from the following factors:

1. Top-level support by the university's President, Vice-President (Academic) and other senior administration; sanctioned by the Senate through the appointment of a committee responsible to it.

2. The serious, constantly up-dated effort to consult student opinion in evaluating courses and the stress based on the confidentiality of the results. They are the sole property of the faculty member.

3. The low profile of the coordinator who never brow-beats and only occasionally cajoles. He is not set apart in an administrative office but works out of his department, clearly an academic colleague, not an academic technocrat or consultant.

4. The utilization of the University's existing resourses without appealing for substantial funding from the administration. Audio-visual Services, experienced faculty and the occasional off-campus guest combine to provide the services offered. Financially, this is a shoestring operation, financed by a tiny annual budget from University funds.

5. Modest levels of expectation. We have not held out a magic wand or any hope of instant change or success either to the University administration or to academics. Our strategy has been to work unobtrusively mindful that our colleagues are too wise mindlessly to equate innovation with improvement.

6. Perhaps the most telling indicator for success is the good intent of the average faculty member. Like Gaff and Wilson, we believe that "most faculty consider teaching a central activity and a major source of satisfaction" (Gaff and Wilson, 1971), one which is not the object of disdain that popular comment would have us believe.

Our contention is that any university can adopt inexpensive devices to improve the quality of the learning for which it is responsible. Indeed, writes Percy Smith, "it is our view that teaching is the principal means with which universities discharge their responsibilities" (Smith, 1969). Our experience is but one of a variety of models available. What

is in question is not so much the means as the will. The conditions we work with have been indispensable and are likely to be necessary elsewhere. We offer our experience as one approach to dispelling the dreariness of indifferent and slovenly teaching by a modest expectation of improvement.

References

1. Gaff, J.G. and Wilson, R.C. Faculty Values and Improving Teaching, New Teaching New Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. 1971, p.40.

2. Sheffield, E.F. Approaches (Mostly Elsewhere) to the Improvement of Teaching in Higher Education, Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. XXI, No. 1, Winter, 1973, pp. 5-6.

3. Smith, J.P. Teach -- or Get Lost, C.A.U.T. Bulletin, Vol. 17, No. 4, April 1969, p.3.

4. Whitfield, R.P. and Brammer, L.M. The Ills of College Teaching: Diagnosis and prescription, Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLIV, No. 1, January 1972, p.1.

YORK UNIVERSITY

Chris Furedy - Kathryn Koenig - Igor Kusyszyn

Interested in Effective Teaching?

Development Of Teaching Skills

A Development of Teaching Skills programme is being offered for all full-time or part-time faculty, instructors or teaching assistants concerned about effective teaching and interested in examining ideas and techniques related to the teaching-learning process.

The meetings will consist of informal discussions led by York University professors. Come and share your ideas.

Topics include:

- student attitudes & expectations
- facilitating student participation
- plagiarism
- choosing a text — should you?
- setting course objectives
- grades — an impediment to creativity?
- using audio-visual aids
- lecturing skills

watch the Daily Bulletin for announcements of discussion topics.

Bring your lunch and attend as many or as few sessions as you like, starting *Tuesday, September 23rd* at noon.

Mondays & Tuesdays 12 noon to 2 p.m.
Wednesdays & Thursdays 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.

Lounge 108, Behavioural Sciences Bldg.

For further information contact:
Dr. Igor Kusyszyn (667-3213)

Counselling & Development Centre

STARTING SMALL:
YORK'S DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING SKILLS PROGRAMME

By Chris Furedy,
Division of Social Science;
Igor Kusyszyn,
Psychology/Counselling
and Development Centre;
Sandra Pyke,
Psychology/Counselling
and Development Centre

CONCERN FOR STUDENT LEARNING

The Development of Teaching Skills Programme is a voluntary programme open to all teachers on campus. It grew out of a concern for student learning rather than faculty teaching. In 1970, Dr. Sandra Pyke, cross-appointed to the Counselling and Development Centre and the Psychology Department, offered a "group communication programme" to students (Pyke and Neeley, 1970; 1975). The programme was designed to assist students to participate more effectively in tutorial and discussion situations. It was apparent, however that a successful tutorial experience depended on instructor skills as well as student capabilities. Student complaints about the tutorial system (awkwardness of tutors in leading discussions, insufficient guidance for preparing assignments, and a lack of organisation of the tutorial curriculum) indicated a need for some sort of tutorial training for tutors. Thus, the following year a small pilot training programme was conducted by Dr. Pyke and Mr. Edwards within the context of a research project on the effectiveness of two styles of training. The resultant tutorial leaders programme offered faculty either a skilled training highly structured approach or unstructured discussion sessions (Edwards, 1972).

In the fall term of 1973-74, working under the auspices of the Counselling and Development Centre, Dr. Chris Furedy of the Division of Social Science initiated the development of teaching skills programme with Dr. Pyke acting as consultant and supervisor. This experience was well received by participating faculty and sufficient interest was aroused to warrant a full-year programme conducted by Dr. Furedy in 1974-75. This year the project is directed by Dr. Igor Kusyszyn, who is jointly appointed with the Department of Psychology and the Counselling and Development Centre. Dr. Kusyszyn is able to give half-time to the programme; this is considerably more than Dr. Furedy's "two hours" in the previous year.

TESTING THE GROUND

While our small start was largely dictated by available funds and faculty time, there were other reasons for initial low-level development. We were testing the ground at a time when there were few other such programmes in Ontario universities. This was the approach which had been adopted in the initiation of some successful faculty development programmes in Britain and Australia. In effect, one had either to set up a programme with considerable status in the administrative order and ample resources, or one could start at the grass roots. We reasoned that, given the tightness of funds for innovation in the university, we should first test whether it could be met by drawing upon existing resources on the campus.

So the aims of the teaching skills programme were (and are) modest. We wish to provide, as a first step, an opportunity for voluntary, informal exchange of knowledge and opinions about university teaching and student learning by bringing together in discussion groups interested teachers from all levels. Through such participation we had hoped to reach one of our explicit goals: "to encourage departments, divisions and colleges in the university to develop instruments for improving teaching in their areas of specialty" (Furedy, 1975). However, we had no funds to dispense in grants for such purposes and York has no university committee on teaching to oversee and encourage such efforts.

DISCUSSION GROUPS AND CONSULTATION

Discussion groups, meeting for eight to ten weeks of each term, have been the core of the programme. A variety of activities took place in these meetings in the first two years of the programme. Some were devoted to open discussion of topics such as the functions of the tutorial as a mode of instruction or the dynamics of the first class. On other occasions, guest speakers, drawn mostly from York's faculty,

addressed issues on higher education or spoke of their experiences as teachers. Students were specifically invited to some sessions (they were free to attend any) to give their views on tutorials, lectures, grades and assignments. A kit of readings provided the focus of discussion at other times. A few sessions were devoted to role playing or some informal types of skilled training. Participants were encouraged to have a class video-taped, and these tapes were occasionally played to the group as a whole.

In addition to directing the discussions, Dr. Furedy was available for consultation. Occasionally she was called upon to consult with the department or a course team, but she was approached more often by individuals who wanted her to view a class or who desired advice about the evaluation of teaching. Throughout 1973/74 and 1974/75 a total of ninety persons were regular members of discussion groups. Teaching assistants formed the largest single category of participants, but the most active and interested were, typically, assistant professors with approximately three years of teaching experience. All ranks, from part-time instructors to full professors were represented among participants (Pyke & Furedy, 1974 and Furedy, 1975).

GUEST SEMINARS

The objective of this year's director, Dr. Igor Kusyszyn, has been to involve as large a number of York University professors as possible in the delivery of seminars on the subject of the teaching/learning process. Individuals known to have a special interest in this were invited to lead seminars on relevant subjects of their choice. Response was very positive with twenty-two persons, including President H. Ian Macdonald, volunteering to offer seminars in the first term alone. Topics ranged from specific techniques such as personalized instruction, the inquiry method, and the use of media in the classroom, to more general subjects such as trends in higher education and alternatives to lectures (Kusyszyn, 1975). The seminars were very well received with an average attendance of seven persons per day, four days a week.

CONCERNS OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

From observation of the discussions and seminars and from evaluation questionnaires distributed at the end of the year, we have been able to document a variety of issues which preoccupy concerned teachers on the York campuses. We have demonstrated that there is a considerable number of professors who are constantly seeking innovative instructional techniques to meet the special needs of their students. Many are eager to share their knowledge or hypotheses with their colleagues. The majority of those who attend group meetings are seeking models of good teachers and particular techniques Most faculty realize, indeed insist, that "teaching methods" cannot long be divorced from specific subject matters. They are seeking models of good teachers and particular techniques which they can adapt to their own teaching requirements. The greatest obstacle to improvement by cited participants is lack of time. time to attend discussion sessions, time to redesign courses, time to develop skills, time to spend working with students, time to do research contributing directly to teaching. The ambiguity of the reward system of the university and departmental unconcern are seen as secondary although not unimportant. The teachers who attend the Teaching Skills Programme are on the whole, good teachers, with high intrinsic motivation to improve the quality of teaching and learning in their classes (Furedy, 1975).

WORKSHOPS AND CLASS OBSERVATION

If funds are available to expand the programme next year to the equivalent of a full-time load, our next step will be to offer workshops on specific aspects of teaching (eg. lecturing) and further consultation and observation of classes. These are services for which demand appears to be high.

The considerable response to the broadly defined approach to teaching effectiveness in the first term of 1975 has reinforced our conviction that there are unexploited human resources, within the York community. We plan to continue to tap these in the following months.

INDIVIDUAL COMMITMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORTS

There are many ways in which to respond to the growing concern for the quality of teaching (and of learning) in our universities. Most of the schemes which are well known entail well-staffed and well funded centres with considerable status in the university structure. York's programme is an example of a small scale effort which grew out of the commitment of a few individuals and the support of one unit in the university (the Counselling Centre). Such a program can achieve little if it is not augmented by a battery of other supports: enlightened curriculum development in departments, technical service provided by the media staff, rewards for good teaching in the tenure/promotion process, grants for release time for research into higher education or for the development of new instructional modes, interest and support from high-level administrators, and enthusiasm from students. All these requirements are not present in equal measure at York, but there is a potential for each of them.

We believe it is undesirable to foster the assumption that practical concern for the quality of university teaching can be delegated to a few persons in the university who may be directly involved in a programme or a centre. Hence at York we have worked, with admittedly slim resources, to involve as many interested faculty, administrators and students as we can in our discussion format. These efforts have revealed that York has many individuals with a high commitment to improvement of teaching. We believe we have established that a *beginning* can be made in a university without a large commitment of funds and without waiting for the appointment of a specialist to direct a centre. To have a substantial impact, however, teaching and curriculum improvement programmes must be enabled to meet the varied needs of the faculty in a comprehensive manner. We welcome comments on our efforts and suggestions for our development in the future.

REFERENCES

1. Pyke, S. W. & Neely, C.A. Evaluation of a group communication training programme. *Journal of Communication*, 1970, *20*, 291-304.

2. Pyke, S.W. & Neely, C. A. Training and evaluation of communication skills. *Canadian Counsellor*, 1975, *9*, 20-30.

3. Edwards, J. L. A comparison of skill training and T-group approaches with "work-oriented" and "person-oriented" group members. Unpublished Master's Thesis, York University, Toronto, 1972.

4. Pyke, S.W. & Furedy, C. *The Development of Teaching Skills Programme*. York University, Counselling & Development Centre Internal Report, 1973/74.

5. Furedy, Chris. The Development of Teaching Skills. York University, Counselling & Development Centre, Internal Report No. 78, 1974/75 (copies available from C. Furedy, Division of Social Science, York).

6. Kusyszyn, Igor. "York University Development of Teaching Skills Seminars," Fall Term 1975 (list of speakers and topics available from Dr. I. Kusyszyn, Counselling & Development Centre, York).

Reprinted from Newsletter #9,
February 1976, Ontario Universities
Program for Instructional Development

YORK UNIVERSITY

WORKSHOP ON LECTURING

Friday October 24 & Saturday October 25

9:30 – 4:30 each day

Participants will –

- discuss problems in lecturing to large classes
- evaluate a lecture
- deliver a mini-lecture
- acquire vocalisation skills for lecture halls

Open to all teachers at York engaged in lecturing or preparing for lecturing duties.

Staff for the Workshop

- Dr. Chris Furedy (Division of Social Science) Coordinator
- Dean Green (Faculty of Fine Arts)
- Dr. Robert Haynes (Department of Biology)
- Dr. Norman Welsh (Faculty of Fine Arts)

The Workshop is limited to 15 participants; some spaces are still available.
If interested contact:

- Chris Furedy 667-6274 (Urban Studies) or 924-2484 (residence)

There is no fee for the Workshop. Lunches will be provided.

YORK UNIVERSITY

WORKSHOP ON LECTURING

October 24 & 25, 1975

Co-ordinator:	Dr. Chris Furedy, Division of Social Science (local 6274)
Staff:	Dean Green, Faculty of Fine Arts (local 3881) Dr. Robert Haynes, Dept. of Biology (local 3562) Dr. Norman Welsh, Faculty of Fine Arts (local 3995)
Technical Assistance:	Mr. Jim Fichette, Counselling and Development Centre Mr. Mark Salusbury, Counselling and Development Centre Mr. Gerrick Filewood
Place:	The Workshop will be held in these rooms in the Administrative Studies Building, Main Campus: 035, 036, 037, and 102. The rooms for each session are given below. Lists and rooms for small groups will be given out at the Workshop.
Time:	The first session will begin at 9:30 a.m. each day. Sessions will finish by 4:30 p.m.

The Workshop concentrates on three areas in lecturing skills:
a. preparation and delivery of lectures
b. analysis and evaluation of lectures
c. vocalization techniques for lecture halls.

A major function of the Workshop is to give participants the opportunity to view themselves lecturing, to develop styles of self-evaluation and to receive the comments of colleagues.

SCHEDULE

Friday, October 24th

SESSION I: 9:30 a.m.-11:00 a.m., Room 102, Admin Studies Bldg.

Directed discussion of major concerns in university lecturing: for instance, What can be successfully achieved in lectures? How do students learn in lectures? What qualities do students appreciate in a lecturer? Should lectures allow for student participation? Are there alternatives to the classical lecture style?

11:00 a.m. - 11:15 a.m. Coffee/tea break Room 102 Admin Studies

SESSION II: 11:10 a.m.-12:00 p.m., Room 035, Admin Studies Bldg.

Participants, cast in the role of students, will listen to a lecture delivered by Dr. Robert Haynes.

SESSION III: 12:00 p.m.-1:00 p.m., Rooms 101, 102, 103, Admin Studies Bldg.

Participants will break into three groups of five persons to evaluate the lecture, using a lecture evaluation form.

1:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. Lunch. Dr. Eric Winter, Master of Calumet College, has invited the Workshop for an informal lunch in his office, Room 118, Atkinson College, Phase I.

SESSION IV: 2:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m., Room 102, Admin Studies Bldg.

Further evaluation of Dr. Haynes' lecture, concentrating on structure, organization and student understanding.

SESSION V: 3:00 p.m.- 4:30 p.m., Room 035, Admin Studies Bldg.

Keynote lecture: "The Art of Lecturing," Dean Green
(Open to members of the university at large.)

SESSION VI: 4:30 p.m.- 5:00p.m., Room 102, Admin Studies Bldg.

Briefing on the preparation of participants' mini-lectures.

5:00 p.m. Sherry and cheese party,
Counselling and Development Centre, Room 108,
Behavioural Sciences Building.

Saturday, October 25th

SESSION VII: 9:30 a.m.-11:00 p.m., Rooms 035, 036 and 037,
Admin Studies Bldg.

Mini-Lectures: Each participant will deliver a ten minute lecture to a group of four others. They will be videotaped. Participants will evaluate lectures using the lecture evaluation form.

11:00 a.m. Coffee break

SESSION VIII: 11:10 a.m.-1:00 p.m., Rooms 035, 036 and 037,
Admin Studies Bldg.

Videotape re-runs. Participants may view their tapes privately or with a colleague.

1:00 p.m. Lunch Room 102 Admin Studies

SESSION IX: 2:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m., Room 035, Admin Studies Bldg.

Professor Norman Welsh will speak generally on the topic of vocalisation in lecture halls and specifically give suggestions regarding the vocalising of participants.

The Workshop will end by 4:00 p.m. Participants will be asked to evaluate the Workshop session by session, returning evaluations to Chris Furedy.

Funding and other support for the Workshop was received from:

Dean Arthurs, Faculty of Administrative Studies
The Counselling and Development Centre
Dean Dimma, Osgoode Law School
Dean Eisen, Faculty of Arts
President H. Ian Macdonald
Eric Winter, Master, Calumet College
Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development
(indirect support).

I wish to thank all for their co-operation.

Chris Furedy
Division of Social Science

York University Development of Teaching Skills Seminars

Dr. Igor Kusyszyn, Director 1976-76

Dated March 1976

	Date	Time	Topic	Lecturer
1.	Tues. Sept.23	12 noon	"The dynamics of the first class" (The powerful impact of the first meeting on student expectations necessitates careful planning and conductance of this class. A tone is set for the rest of the classes at this time).	Dr. Igor Kusyszyn, Department of Psycholog Counselling & Development Centre
2.	Wed. Sept.24	11 a.m.	"Meeting the first tutorial" (The teacher and the students familiarize themselves with one another's backgrounds and expectations for the tutorial).	Dr. Chris Furedy, Division of Social Science
3.	Thurs.Sept.25	11 a.m.	"Designing your course to fit your attitudes and capabilities" (The teacher should be aware of his personal feelings toward students, the course, and teaching, including his biases and should be authentic in the classroom).	Dr. Ron Sheese, Department of Psycholog
4.	Mon. Sept.29	12 noon	"Do's and don'ts in teaching from my personal experience" (Emphasized treating students as colleagues and encouraging them to think as you do. Stressed the importance of finding out how much the student already knows, making the subject enjoyable, and not overburdening students with readings).	Dr. David Reid, Department of Psycholog
5.	Tues. Sept.30	12 noon	"Carl Rogers' Humanistic approach to teaching" (Proposed the idea that for learning to be lasting it must be self-initiated by the student and not forced by the teacher)	Dr. Igor Kusyszyn, Department of Psycholog Counselling & Development Centre
6.	Wed. Oct. 1	11 a.m.	"Alternatives to lecturing" (Pointed out that the lecture method is one of the least efficient ways of communicating information. Suggested learning cells, seminars, problem-solving groups as alternatives).	Paul Blythe, Counselling Services, Atkinson College

7.	Thurs. Oct. 2	11 a.m.	"Student opinions of York University teaching" (Suggested that students learn by modeling the professor more than by respecting the content of the course)	Students and faculty participated
8.	Mon. Oct. 6	12 noon	"The changing York University culture and its effects on my teaching" (Suggested that altering teaching styles is imperative due to changing expectations of students over time)	Dr. Harvey Mandel, Department of Psychology, Counselling & Development Centre
9.	Tues. Oct. 7	12 noon	"Our responsibility to students headed for failure - spoonfeeding?" (Emphasized the need for remedial courses and special teaching methods for students having difficulties with certain topics such as statistics).	Dr. Ed Haltrecht, OCUFA teaching award recipient
10.	Wed. Oct. 8	11 a.m.	"Teaching and the Open University" (Introduced the naturalistic approach to teaching art in which students are given the freedom to create using whatever materials the environment contains).	Mr. Simon Nicholson, Open University, England
11.	Tues. Oct. 14	12 noon	"Open discussion: Personal frustrations in teaching" (This was the only seminar which no one attended. The Director, Dr. Kusyszyn, reflected on the frustrations of organizing a teaching improvement program.)	
12.	Wed. Oct. 15	11 a.m.	"Presentation of self" (Pointed out the techniques of presenting oneself as a lecturer in order to command attention and respect).	Dean Joseph Green, Faculty of Fine Arts
13.	Thurs. Oct. 16	11 a.m.	"You can only teach them what they already know" (Stressed the difficulty in penetrating students' cognitive and affective templates which become rigid at an early age).	Dr. Neil Agnew, Department of Psychology, Counselling & Development Centre

14.	Mon.	Oct. 20	12 noon	"Facilitating participation in a large class" (Gave twenty methods to aid learning and involvement in a large course of several hundred students).	Dr. Sandra Pyke, Department of Psychology, Counselling & Development Centre
15.	Tues.	Oct. 21	12 noon	"Trends in higher education" (Predicted that in the next few years universities will become more applied adult education centres catering more to people between ages 20 and 39 years, due to economic and political hardships and population trends).	Dr. David Bakan, Department of Psychology
16.	Wed.	Oct. 22	11 a.m.	"Media in the classroom" (Demonstrated the contribution of audio-visual aids to teaching effectiveness).	Mr. David Homer, Department of Instructional Aid Resources
17.	Thurs.	Oct. 23	11 a.m.	"Contracting and the Keller Plan" (Discussed the usefulness of self-paced learning in recognition of the fact that individual students learn at different rates).	Dr. K. Rudestam, Department of Psychology
18.	Mon.	Oct. 27	12 noon	"Are women professors disadvantaged in teaching?" (Presented data indicating the special problems female teachers sometimes face).	Dr. Anne-Marie Henshel, Department of Sociology
19.	Tues.	Oct. 28	12 noon	"Teaching students how to write: Whose responsibility?" (Emphasized the responsibility of professors to teach basic writing skills to unskilled students).	Dr. Michael Rehner, Department of English and the Writing Workshop
20.	Wed.	Oct. 29	11 a.m.	"How to organize a large course with teaching assistants" (Described an effective organizational network involving students, tutorials, lectures, teaching assistants and the professor).	Dr. Otto Friedman, Division of Social Science

21.	Mon.	Nov. 3	12 noon	"The Inquiry Method of Teaching à la McLuhan" (Suggested that the primary goal of teaching was to teach students how to think and how to solve problems independently, and proposed question asking, not lecture giving, as the method to reach the goal).	Dr. Igor Kusyszyn, Department of Psychology, Counselling & Development Centre
22.	Tues.	Nov. 4	12 noon	"Relevance and the adaptability of your teaching method to a particular class" (Stressed the need to make even historical material relevant to today's student. Pointed out the importance of modifying a course plan according to the progress and interests of each particular class).	Professor Helje Porré, Department of French, OCUFA teaching award recipient
23.	Wed.	Nov. 5	11 a.m.	"After ten years" (Illustrated teaching to be several things: the art of communication, inspiration, emulation, and the rites of initiation).	President H. Ian Macdonald
24.	Thurs.	Nov. 6	11 a.m.	"Methods of Personalized Instruction" (Pointed out the importance of administering to the individual differences in the rates of learning among students).	Dr. Ron Sheese, Department of Psychology
25.	Mon.	Nov. 10	12 noon	"Alternatives to tutorials" (Recognized the need to shift away from a tutorial system at the university level because it is not meeting the educational needs of the modern student).	Dr. Ted Olson, Division of Social Science
26.	Tues.	Nov. 11	12 noon	"A paradox of educational communication" (Demonstrated experimentally that the expertise of the professor is an impediment to student understanding due to vastly different levels of sophistication).	Dr. Richard Goranson, Department of Psychology

	Thurs.	Nov. 13	11 a.m.	"How students learn in lectures: Implications for the lecturer" (Emphasized that feedback from students to the professor about his teaching is critical to the improvement of teaching).	Professor Niall Byrne, Department of Psychiatry, University of Toronto
28.	Wed.	Jan. 14	12 noon	"Will the real teachers please stand up" (Pointed out that the students' image of the teacher as a person and as a professional has a pronounced effect on their respect for the course material).	Dr. Eric Winter, Master of Calumet College
29.	Thurs.	Jan. 15	12 noon	"Discussion in Dyads: The learning cell" (The use of dyadic discussions recognizes learning to be an active and insightful process).	Dr. Robert Deutsch, Department of Psychology Atkinson College
	Wed.	Jan. 21	12 noon	"The future of the new universities" (The universities established since 1945 have each had periods of innovation then retrenchment. The probability of a second period of innovation is determined by the quality of leadership).	Dr. Richard Storr, History Department
31.	Wed.	Jan. 28	12 noon	"Talking about the object at hand" (Popularized general concepts such as "alienation" tend to keep us away from the study of real life problems).	Dr. Robert Cluett, Graduate Programme Department of English
32.	Thurs.	Jan. 29	12 noon	"Can we evaluate teaching?" (Recognized the importance and complexity of the evaluation of teaching and identified several diverse criteria for its basis).	Dr. Martin Muldoon, Mathematics Department

33.	Wed.	Feb. 4	12 noon	"The process is the message" (Teaching can only be improved through the knowledge of the students' learning process. The methods by which students conceptualize the subject, take notes, read textbooks and study for examinations must be known to the teacher if he is to increase his effectiveness).	Dr. Paul Hollander, Calumet College
34.	Thurs.	Feb. 5	12 noon	"The dialectic of the contemporary university" (York University is presently in a period of quiescent recovery. Professors seem to be quietly on the watch for leadership, purpose and direction).	Dr. Howard Adelman, Philosophy Department Atkinson College
35.	Wed.	Feb. 11	12 noon	"Using undergraduates as teaching assistants" (Undergraduate teaching assistants are effective because they are enthusiastic about the subject matter, approach the subject from the learner's perspective and can easily communicate with the student).	Ms. Judy Snow, Psychology Department

ATTENDANCE: The 35 seminars attracted 221 participants.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR

Alan Gold

OUPID Workshop on Instructional Development

March 23, 1976

Instructional Development at the University of Windsor

Until March 1974, what instructional development occurred at the University of Windsor was a result of local initiatives on the part of instructors, departments or faculties; there was no university body specifically concerned with the instructional process as such.

On March 7, Dr. F.A. DeMarco, Senior Vice-President and OUPID Liaison Officer, called an organizational meeting, which over forty faculty members attended, to establish an Interim Committee on Instructional Development. A Committee of ten persons was formally constituted, and began meeting under the chairmanship of Dr. DeMarco. Subcommittees were established on (i) Functions and Terms of Reference
(ii) Goals and Priorities
(iii) Reward system for good teaching
(iv) Interdisciplinary Projects

Reports were considered from the first three of these committees, and it was decided that a first task would be to seek some statement from the Senate of the University legitimizing instructional development as an academic endeavour. Eventually the Senate passed an amendment to the policy statement on Faculty duties and responsibilities, including among the areas of academic scholarship "the study and evaluation of methods to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the University instructional process". A somewhat similar amendment to the policy statement on promotion criteria was, however, rejected.

The Interim Committee has also circulated a newsletter on Instructional Development, and hosted a visit on campus by Dr. Swift of the British Open University.

As a committee to advise the Liaison Officer, it has reviewed the conditions of awards at the request of OUPID, received the OUPID Evaluator, Dr. Main, on his visit to the campus, and later met to discuss the Evaluation report.

At the moment, the Interim Committee is not directly involved in organized teaching and learning activities. However, in his Report on Extension and Continuing Education, Dr. DeMarco has made two recommendations.

i) a fund be established for experiments and innovations, and a committee for curriculum development, in the area of extension and continuing education,

ii) a Program for Instructional Service and Development, be established, including a committee with a budget to provide support for teaching improvement, experimentation and innovation, and services and counsel for testing, evaluation and examination.

The Senate has referred these proposals to its Academic Planning Committee for report back.

As the Interim Committee has no official position in the University's organization chart, its effectiveness has been rather limited by its low profile. Substantial developments will need to await eventual Senate action on the proposals mentioned above.

REPORTS FROM DISCUSSION GROUP SESSIONS

Reports presented by Group Leaders

REPORT FROM DISCUSSION GROUP A

delivered by Peter Meincke

We began by listing all activities that a university might undertake to improve teaching and learning, and we then tried to establish a priority in this list. Most members of the group felt that activities such as evaluation, (a very broad term into which one can read a great deal), definition of objectives, support from the top, grass roots support, communication, and, above all, identification of a key individual were very important. This key individual should be within the existing academia and identified as someone to whom one could go for assistance. But we could not actually decide what to call this individual except to define him in terms of a shoulder to cry on, a resource person, a person to act as a friendly counsellor, a diagnostician. This person's role was one of the key items that we felt to be important in terms of activities that could go on in a university.

One of our group felt that it is extremely important to improve individual study skills through writing labs and other methods. Other points stressed were the provision of funds, examples of good teaching, and establishing a dialogue between teacher and learner, giving the learner some idea of what is expected of him as well as enlightening the teacher.

Other points not felt to be as important as those listed above but still of significance are as follows: improving student awareness as to what to expect from the university experience; release time or study leave for faculty; good service facilities, such as audio-visual; research into teaching and learning; clinics, analysis and remedial work; success stories--that is, publicizing successful attempts to improve the teaching and learning process.

In terms of OUPID's role, it was felt that the Program could assist in each of these aforementioned activities--dissemination of information about programs, funding study leaves, development of hardware-software packages (all of which it has been doing), but that it should mainly look at each university to identify

particular areas where funds could be most advantageously used. The fact that the universities are all at different stages requires flexibility in treatment--an idea which came up in the conferences in January and February (Workshops for OUPID Liaison Officers, Toronto, January 1976, and for OUPID Study Leave Grantees, Toronto, February 1976.)

With respect to models, the group attacked that question in terms of asking about the degree of institutionalization required to improve teaching and learning. There were considerable reservations about having a permanent, monolithic structure or centre in a university which would be the key area for instructional development; but it was felt that there should be some focus, probably at the very least a committee and possibly one or two people with special duties in this area. A central information resource for library and other material might also be useful. The general feeling was that it would be extremely important to keep the precise activities decentralized and as close as possible to where the actual teaching and learning takes place rather than housing such activities in a centre to which people would come.

REPORT FROM DISCUSSION GROUP B

delivered by George Harrower

Group B tackled a number of these problems. The first question we asked ourselves was the question of the motivation of professors because, after all, they are the people who have to do whatever is to be done. We immediately agreed that one of the motivating factors is money, but that it is only one factor and probably not the most important one. Of greater importance is the satisfaction of communicating with students--one of the great rewards of good teaching. In this modern age when students are mobile from university to university, class to class, there is a sense of competition among classes; if a student does not know upon his arrival at university who the good professors are, he will soon find out. Success in attracting a reasonable number of serious students strongly motivates professors and rewards good teaching.

What then is successful teaching? Motivation is a large part of it for both professor and student. Much of the teaching process occurs in the mind of the student; unless it goes on there, it does not go on at all. It won't begin in a young mind, a mind preoccupied with many other things, unless an older, and hopefully wiser, mind provides some subtle motivation to keep the process going. One does not become a good teacher quickly; it takes several years, often much of one's lifetime, devoted to developing one's particular talents with the hope that the results will be something special. Part of this struggle that any teacher faces is the matter of assessment, whether it be self-assessment or assessment by students--which can sometimes be a flighty, ephemeral thing--or assessment by his department, his colleagues, and his university as a whole.

Assessment of teaching ought to be fair, honest and visible. To these ends professors ought to work more in the open. We tend to close or even lock our doors after the bell has rung, as if something terribly wrong would happen should some of our precious words leak out into the corridors. Teaching ought to be done more in the open where not only other students but also other faculty would be

aware of what is happening. This in itself would provide some motivation for higher levels of performance. The defense against opening the doors, of course, is the old chestnut, "academic freedom". I don't think I've ever found two words with so many different meanings. Academic freedom is too often interpreted to mean, "I do anything I like, when I like, how I like; sometimes I don't even bother doing it at all". Academic freedom is surely no defense; on the contrary, academic freedom works both ways--freedom not only to teach but the freedom to be taught and to listen in a public and open atmosphere.

Looking at the problems all of us face as teachers, our group realized these began perhaps when we were graduate students; we echoed some of the wise words that we heard this morning about various ways in which graduate students might benefit from a somewhat more formal approach to their various teaching assistant responsibilities. This, in my personal opinion, is more important than it used to be. We are not only concerned with getting good teaching support from these young people, but we are also aware of the fact that when they go out into their professional lives, their ability to communicate with their peers, superiors, and the public at large will be all important even though they may not be teachers in the sense that you and I may be. Such a program could quite simply be enforced: "If you wish to be a teaching assistant, there is a procedure in the first month of the term in which you go through certain routines. Hopefully some of the rough edges are smoothed and your job is made simpler." In places where this is done, it is reliably reported that graduate students like the idea. Although they work very hard in the first month making sure they know what is required, the balance of the year is easier, partly because they are assured they are on the right course.

Another of the defenses against attempting to train teachers, if I may use that terrible word, is one which is seldom admitted but which is always present. A month ago I was involved in a substantial debate at Queen's which really revolved around the point, would departments be willing to state publicly what

their objectives are. The answer, after an hour and-a-half, was no, they would not. That was that. "No thank you, please take away your proposal." That is one of the reasons why even senior professors are reluctant to involve themselves in what one might call, for want of a better expression, "training programs" of either their junior colleagues or their graduate students. Reluctant because these bright young people are first of all going to say, "What is it we are really trying to do?"; sometimes we are not so sure.

One fruitful avenue of approach to the improvement of teaching is the one which we always mention, that of innovation, looking for new ways and hoping perhaps that we will stumble on something fortunate. A second and equally fruitful and possibly better approach is to try to identify good teaching where it already exists and to ask what is really going on. When Professor X gets those excellent results year after year, what is he really doing? We are not thinking in terms of the detail of his presentation, his idiosyncracies, the way he writes on the blackboard or whatever, but rather the logical frame of mind he brought to his class and the challeng which he presented subtly week by week. It seems that quite a bit of good, analytical research done on existing good teaching might have the effect of balancing the equally important field of innovation in teaching.

The group touched on the fact that all of this is in the public domain to an increasing extent, and universities are being challenged almost daily to prove that they are doing whatever it is they do and doing it well. We agreed that the public often does not really know what we are doing, but editorial writers and politicians believe they do. It is not enough simply to say that we are above all that fuss. Professors and universities in general will have to defend themselves and present a more open approach to the world at large. (Surely if we are going to be more open in general with the public and all those wonderful taxpayers, we are going to have to be a little more open with our colleagues--I mean, leave the doors open.) Too often in thinking of what the public wants,

we fail to justify the relevance of what we are doing. Relevance was a very revolutionary word not so many years ago. It is still around with its good, old-fashioned meaning. I think the mistake we make is in thinking that the only relevant things are the things which allow one to make a living along some simple career path. Many other things which are highly relevant to modern life--such as literature, history, philosophy, etc.--are not always believed by their professors to be as relevant as in fact they are. Personally, speaking as a natural scientist, I wish that some of my philosopher friends would stand up and say, "The only thing that really counts is whether or not you can think clearly".

Instructional technology is something our group did not touch on to any great extent. There is no doubt that we benefit from all the things which are now available. Some of them are evolutionary trends from earlier devices. After all, we have been showing lantern slides for a very long time. Television is all right, too; it is simple and cheap and it motivates. In a first-year class, where that initial impact is so necessary, these devices, properly used, and cleverly presented, can certainly be an important factor in motivating students for the more serious work which must follow.

We agreed that in all of this the department of the modern Canadian university is the important entity. Universities must, of course, provide a general academic framework, but the fact of the matter is that most of us identify more strongly with our department and our discipline than with our university. This is a perfectly good phenomenon. We should take advantage of this strength. If we are going to get professors to do the right things, we have got to get them to do the right things within the departmental framework, which is where they live. Perhaps it might be possible, along with all these other marvelous teaching tools, for some of you who are clever in these ways to invent a departmental kit which would come all wrapped up and packaged. It

would simply be left for the curious to open. It would begin by asking some of the subtle questions that ought to be asked. If you had devised this kit well and assembled it in the appropriate manner, it might lead a department to internally assess itself in ways never considered in a head-on approach externally imposed.

Finally, the professor is the heart of the matter. Professors, like other people, need to be persuaded that changes which they embrace are really their own ideas. In administration, the last thing one can say is, "I told you so". Professors, like other people, are sensitive, and unlike some other people, they are highly intelligent, by and large; therefore, they like to steer their own courses, and why shouldn't they? They are well suited to do so. It would seem, therefore, that the heart of the matter lies with the individual teacher in whom we have previously put our trust, who as a member of a department must be prepared to steer his own course, to devise the solutions to his own problems. We looking on from the outside in neighboring departments must be patient; these things all take time. Our group's conlusion was that the time they take to evolve will be well worth it.

REPORT FROM DISCUSSION GROUP C

delivered by Harry Murray

Our group talked about several things, none of which were on the agenda. I will try to recall some of th persisting themes of our discussion.

We talked all day about good teaching, as though we all knew what that meant; but we really don't, nor do we have a clear way of measuring it. It was agreed that student ratings, although sneered at, are probably the best single measure of teaching available.

An interesting point was made that we use number of publications as a measure of research, a somewhat arbitrary measure. We accept that measure without submitting it to the same tests of reliability and validity to which we put student ratings. We discussed this asymmetrical treatment in our measurement of research and teaching.

Another frequently raised point in connection with defining good teaching was the necessity of defining objectives of teaching in the university. As the previous speaker mentioned, that is hardly ever done nor are we willing to do it. Our group argued that perhaps that is one of the problems with which OUPID should deal. Not that all faculties would have the same objectives, but at least within a given department or a given course, people should be able to state their objectives. This must be done before any measurement of teaching can occur and before "good teaching" can be defined.

The reward structure in most universities does not encourage interest in instructional development. In my department a new faculty member might do four or five years of work on instructional development, and "if he published nothing", might find himself out on the street without a job. Some members of the group said such was not always the case in all departments, but I have a feeling that it would happen frequently. We agreed that some rather drastic changes would have to be made in the reward structure of the university before one could expect faculty to take a very strong interest from the grass roots upwards. One specific idea was

that in funding universities the government might have to stipulate that a certain sum be used for improving teaching or else the money would not be available. This seems rather drastic coming from the top rather than from the bottom, but some group members felt that such a step would be the only way to create widespread interest in improving teaching.

As for activities needed to promote improvement of university teaching, the point was made that defining objectives would reveal ways in which improvements could be made. Again, recognition and rewards have a positive role in this area. A specific suggestion was that there should be continuous feedback from students, continuous evaluation. Not just once at year's end but almost on a daily basis we should be asking students if we are doing the right thing and how we could improve our teaching. Another suggestion was that in the case of course content as opposed to actual teaching style, more use could be made of outside experts who come to a department to evaluate the content of courses, in the same way as one's papers and publications are evaluated from the outside.

REPORT FROM DISCUSSION GROUP D
delivered by Frank Turner

Many of the points discussed by our group have already been covered by previous group leaders. Our group, like some of our students on their exams, did not let the questions get in the way of our answers. Nevertheless, we did touch on most of them.

We began with a theme of not being too pessimistic. Teaching in universities today, as we know, is perhaps not as bad as we tell each other or let the public tell us. We seemed to agree there was a changing "value and attitudinal" system, that supported a commitment to examine teaching, and that there was a strengthening value among ourselves as peers, that it was acceptable to look at teaching, talk about it and share ideas about it. We agreed we did not have to finalize the question as to what constituted the ideal model of teaching; we were comfortable with the concept of diversity, but even in diversity there was a lot to learn.

Much can be learned from what the previous speakers have mentioned. By asking questions and by being pushed to state objectives for our courses and our programs (a key factor as already mentioned by the other groups), we are forced to identify, at least for ourselves, what we consider to be indicators of success. When are we pleased with our own teaching? What are we trying to achieve in our teaching? We agreed it was to our advantage to consider alternatives (such as the experience we are having today), to hear about alternatives (other forms of teaching and resources), and to consider them from the viewpoint of our own teaching requirements. We supported the idea of being guided to an awareness of research findings and then asking of what relevance are such findings to us.

We suggest that sharing can be very useful and that the kind of enthusiasm as that generated today is beneficial. We felt that p.r. is important and that we should stop telling each other how bad the situation is and start telling our funding public that we are working on the problems. We saw some advantages in crossing discipline lines to come together to consider teaching needs. For example, in our group several disciplines were represented, each of which could

offer something of value. We also thought that crossing of institutional lines could be beneficial. Perhaps we let our hair down with strangers in a way which we would not do with our own colleagues in weekly departmental meetings. We agreed that all innovations are not necessarily good; we must at least ask how to make use of these innovations. The need for institutional support was emphasized. Our responsibilities to graduate assistants were also mentioned. We also discussed what our responsibilities to new colleagues should be; what do we do to help the new faculty member in this role of transition?

We thought there was a need to identify different teaching styles and methods as suited to different students. We should also give more thought to the requirements of introductory courses, requirements of undergraduate and graduate students, and most important, the requirements of adult learners in continuing education programs.

The group's general theme was that indeed we did have a considerable amount of accumulated, practiced widsom about teaching and that we make as full use of it as we can.

Report from discussion group E delivered
by Mary Kay Lane

We are all very aware of the public and governmental backlash against university education; we read daily that apparently university degrees are not particularly valued by society, by employers or even by the students themselves. We are somewhat vague, perhaps, about what the deficiencies may actually be, but I think we could agree that this state of affairs has perhaps given some momentum to our concern over instructional development.

The need for instructional development may well be viewed by universities as a way of facilitating the development of individual instructors. Perhaps, however, the concern should be considered in a much broader context; one could view the concern and need for instructional development on a continuum ranging from the broad educational policies and priorities of universities to their programme objectives, their design of programmes and to the implementation of such designs and objectives by particular departments and individual instructors.

If one were to consider only the most basic level of instructional development, that is, that of an individual instructor improving his own particular skill, there is, perhaps, considerable unwillingness among instructors to change or to avail themselves of improvement or development. This is quite understandable because it may not be worth it; the results, in terms of the effects on students, may be very marginal; there has been insufficient evidence given to instructors that improvement is, in fact, worth the effort. The reward system of universities can be summarized as, "adequate teaching and excellent research" - the name of the game. On the other hand, the group felt very strongly that individual improvement could be promoted if instructors were aware that there is a science of instruction, with a variety of skills to learn and resource materials to use. This awareness might well only lead the instructor to conclude that what he has been doing is the best way for him. However, such awareness, whether or not it leads to changes, certainly makes him more responsive to new methods if and when appropriate.